

**KRIS MAYES**  
**ATTORNEY GENERAL**  
 (Firm State Bar No. 14000)

Joshua D. Bendor (No. 031908)  
 Hayleigh S. Crawford (No. 032326)  
 Joshua M. Whitaker (No. 032724)  
 Kathryn E. Boughton (No. 036105)  
 Timothy E.D. Horley (No. 038021)  
 Office of the Arizona Attorney General  
 2005 N. Central Avenue  
 Phoenix, AZ 85004-1592  
 (602) 542-3333  
[Joshua.Bendor@azag.gov](mailto:Joshua.Bendor@azag.gov)  
[Hayleigh.Crawford@azag.gov](mailto:Hayleigh.Crawford@azag.gov)  
[Joshua.Whitaker@azag.gov](mailto:Joshua.Whitaker@azag.gov)  
[Kathryn.Boughton@azag.gov](mailto:Kathryn.Boughton@azag.gov)  
[Timothy.Horley@azag.gov](mailto:Timothy.Horley@azag.gov)  
[ACL@azag.gov](mailto:ACL@azag.gov)

*Attorneys for Defendants*  
*Attorney General Kris Mayes,*  
*ADOT Director Jennifer Toth,*  
*and State of Arizona*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Mi Familia Vota, et al.,  
  
                                 Plaintiffs,  
  
                                 v.  
  
 Adrian Fontes, et al.,  
  
                                 Defendants.

No. CV-22-00509-PHX-SRB (Lead)

**DEFENSE MOTION FOR  
 CLARIFICATION AS TO TRIAL OF  
 CLAIMS SEEKING “ALTERNATIVE  
 GROUNDS” FOR RELIEF**

**(EXPEDITED RULING  
 REQUESTED)**

AND CONSOLIDATED CASES.

No. CV-22-00519-PHX-SRB  
 No. CV-22-01003-PHX-SRB  
 No. CV-22-01124-PHX-SRB  
 No. CV-22-01369-PHX-SRB  
 No. CV-22-01381-PHX-SRB  
 No. CV-22-01602-PHX-SRB  
 No. CV-22-01901-PHX-SRB

1 The Court resolved some claims on summary judgment. *See* Doc. 534. The parties  
 2 recently discovered that they have different views on which types of claims remain for trial.  
 3 This motion seeks clarification on a basic question: whether trial will include claims that  
 4 seek alternative grounds for relief already granted on summary judgment.

### 5 **I. Brief Context**

6 In pretrial discussions, counsel for Non-US Plaintiffs have stated that they expect to  
 7 present at trial any claims that survived summary judgment and the motion to dismiss,  
 8 including:

- 9 (1) claims that would provide “different or broader” relief than the relief granted  
 10 by the Court’s summary judgment ruling, and
- 11 (2) claims that provide “alternative grounds” for the relief granted by the Court’s  
 12 summary judgment ruling.

13 Defendants<sup>1</sup> acknowledge that trial will include Non-US Plaintiffs’ claims for  
 14 “different or broader relief” than granted at summary judgment.<sup>2</sup> However, Defendants are  
 15 not convinced that trial should include claims seeking “alternative grounds” for relief  
 16 already granted at summary judgment.

17 The Court has already ruled that it need not decide claims of this type. For example,  
 18 after concluding that NVRA Section 6 preempts parts of HB 2492, the Court ruled that it  
 19 “need not address the parties’ arguments regarding the effect of [NVRA] Section 8(a) in  
 20 these respects,” and further, it “need not address the parties’ arguments as they relate to the  
 21 Materiality Provision” in related respects. Doc. 534, pgs. 21 n.12, 23 n.14.

22 In addition, some of the Non-US Plaintiffs’ claims are constitutional challenges  
 23 which, though not raised at summary judgment, are aimed at parts of HB 2492 that the  
 24 Court deemed unlawful on nonconstitutional grounds. “A fundamental and longstanding

---

25  
 26 <sup>1</sup> Here the term “Defendants” refers to the State of Arizona and the Arizona Attorney  
 27 General, the Arizona Secretary of State, Intervenor-Defendants Arizona House Speaker  
 28 Toma and Arizona Senate President Petersen, and Intervenor-Defendant RNC.

<sup>2</sup> Defendants also acknowledge that trial will include the United States’ claim that HB  
 2492’s birth place requirement violates the Materiality Provision of the Civil Rights Act.

1 principle of judicial restraint requires that courts avoid reaching constitutional questions in  
2 advance of the necessity of deciding them.” *Lyng v. Nw. Indian Cemetery Protective Ass’n*,  
3 485 U.S. 439, 445 (1988). “Generally, a court will not decide a constitutional question if  
4 there is some other nonconstitutional ground upon which to dispose of the case.” 16 C.J.S.  
5 Constitutional Law § 213 (collecting cases).

## 6 **II. Requested Clarification**

7 Defendants suggest that the Court clarify as follows: Although trial will include  
8 claims for different or broader relief than granted at summary judgment, trial should not  
9 include claims that seek “alternative grounds” for relief granted at summary judgment.

10 Defendants believe that clarification of this basic question will help ensure the  
11 parties are on the same page regarding trial preparation. Defendants are happy to proceed  
12 however the Court directs, including being available for a conference call.

## 13 **III. Defendants’ Understanding of Non-US Plaintiffs’ Position**

14 Counsel for Defendants conferred with counsel for Non-US Plaintiffs but could not  
15 reach agreement on this issue. Counsel for Defendants suggested a joint motion for  
16 clarification and circulated a draft, inviting counsel for Non-US Plaintiffs to add their  
17 position. Counsel for Non-US Plaintiffs declined.

18 Counsel for Non-US Plaintiffs stated that they oppose Defendants’ requested  
19 clarification, explaining: “[W]e believe it is imperative to have the issues in these  
20 consolidated cases definitively resolved in advance of the 2024 elections. As at least some  
21 of the defendants evidently plan to appeal Judge Bolton’s partial summary judgment ruling,  
22 we believe the better course is to resolve the remaining claims now so that any rulings could  
23 be addressed in a single appeal, rather than risk putting Judge Bolton – and the parties – in  
24 the position of conducting a trial on the remaining claims in 2024.”

1 DATED this 5th day of October, 2023.

2  
3 **KRISTIN K. MAYES**  
4 **ATTORNEY GENERAL**

5 By: /s/ Joshua M. Whitaker

6 Joshua D. Bendor (No. 031908)  
7 Hayleigh S. Crawford (No. 032326)  
8 Joshua M. Whitaker (No. 032724)  
9 Kathryn E. Boughton (No. 036105)  
10 Timothy E.D. Horley (No. 038021)

11 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
12 *Attorney General Kris Mayes,*  
13 *ADOT Director Jennifer Toth,*  
14 *and State of Arizona*

15  
16 **COUNSEL FOR REPUBLICAN**  
17 **NATIONAL COMMITTEE**

18 By: /s/ Kory Langhofer (with permission)

19 Kory Langhofer, AZ Bar 024722  
20 Thomas Basile, AZ Bar 031150  
21 Statecraft PLLC  
22 649 N. Fourth Avenue, First Floor  
23 Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
24 (602) 382-4078  
25 kory@statecraftlaw.com  
26 tom@statecraftlaw.com

27 Tyler Green\*  
28 Cameron T. Norris\*  
James P. McGlone\*  
Consovoy McCarthy PLLC  
1600 Wilson Blvd., Ste. 700  
Arlington, VA 22209  
(703) 243-9423  
tyler@consovoymccarthy.com  
cam@consovoymccarthy.com  
jim@consovoymccarthy.com

*\*admitted pro hac vice*

*Counsel for Intervenor-Defendant  
Republican National Committee*

**GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A.**

By: /s/ Hannah Porter (with permission)

Kevin E. O'Malley  
Hannah H. Porter  
Ashley E. Fitzgibbons  
2575 East Camelback Road  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225

*Attorneys for Intervenor-Defendants Toma  
and Petersen*

**SHERMAN & HOWARD L.L.C.**

By: /s/ Craig Morgan (with permission)

Craig A. Morgan  
Shayna Stuart  
Jake Rapp  
2555 E. Camelback Road, Suite 1050  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016

*Attorneys for Defendant Arizona Secretary  
of State Adrian Fontes*